

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-27. No new matter is presented.

Thus, claims 1-27 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REQUEST FOR EXAMINER INTERVIEW:

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned at a time convenient for the Examiner for discussion including the Examiner's comments on page 13 of the outstanding Office Action indicating that focusing on the control/transferring protocols may overcome the U.S. Patent No. 6,185,535 (Hedin) reference.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,269,336 (Ladd) and U.S. Patent No. 6,801,604 (Maes) in further view of Hedin.

Ladd does not teach or suggest “augmenting the speech recognition system...” and “notifying the portal in response to an input which corresponds to the augmenting grammar set responsive to the speech recognition via the second speech recognizer independent of the portal, thereby transferring control over the user interaction back to the portal and performing subsequent speech recognition at the portal”, as recited in claim 1 for example. Independent claims 8, 17, 20 and 25-27 recite similar features.

Instead, Ladd only provides services from the information sources through voice recognition “at the electronic network” where control of the speech recognition always remains. In particular, the ASR unit of Ladd processes each speech input to determine whether a speech pattern matches grammars/vocabulary stored in the database (see, col. 9, lines 26-38), and the VRU server provides results of the processing of speech communications to implement specific functions associated therewith (see, col. 8, lines 55-67 and col. 9, lines 35-38). In contrast, the claimed “notifying” pertains to notifying the portal in response to speech recognition independent of the portal.

Further, as Maes only discusses outsourcing an audio stream to be processed and returns results to the application server that controls the recognition (see, col. 16, lines 12-26),

Maes does not cure the deficiencies of Ladd regarding the independent claims of the present application.

In particular, Maes does not teach or suggest "... executing speech recognition at the second speech recognizer using the augmenting grammar set", as recited in claim 1 (see also similar features in claims 8 17, 20 and 25-27).

On the other hand, Hedin does not teach or suggest "transferring control over user interaction to the second speech recognizer independent of the portal", as recited in claim 1 for example.

The Examiner asserts that Hedin teaches transference of the recognition between different recognition engines without going through the portal. Hedin only discusses communication with a remote server when the system comes across unrecognized portions of an audio input (i.e., for a more powerful ASR)(see, Abstract and Fig. 5 including corresponding text). In other words, the server part in Hedin receives an unrecognized speech and uses its own more powerful ASR to analyze the received speech.

The claimed "transferring control over user interaction to the second speech recognizer independent of the portal" is based on "speech recognition at the second speech recognizer using the augmenting grammar set" (see independent claims). In other words, the speech recognition executed at the second speech recognizer indicates that the input corresponds to the grammar and transfers control back to the portal.

The cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed features including "notifying" responsive to a speech recognition via another (second) speech recognizer independent of the portal and thereby "transferring" or "returning" control over the user interaction back to the portal, as taught by the claimed invention.

Claims depending from the independent claims include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed by the cited references. For at least the reasons stated above, the dependent claims also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

The dependent claims are also independently patentable. For example, as recited in claim 4, the invention includes "transferring a call to another application server which corresponds to the input." The cited references do not teach or suggest transferring a call to "another application server which corresponds to the input", as recited in claim 4.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: April 7, 2008

By: /Temnit Afework/
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

